



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,902	06/21/2006	Alain Burgos	11123.0107U/SWO	7368
23552	7590	05/12/2008	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			CHO, JENNIFER Y	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			1621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/583,902	Applicant(s) BURGOS ET AL.
	Examiner JENNIFER Y. CHO	Art Unit 1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 12-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DP/0656)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 12-21 drawn to a process for the production of ene-amide derivatives of formula (I).

Group II, claim(s) 22-24 drawn to method of manufacture of an amine or an amide compound.

The inventions listed as Groups 1-2 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claim 1 clearly lacks a special technical feature being anticipated or obvious over Johnson (WO 99/18065).

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

During a telephone conversation with Mark Skoog on 5/6/08 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 12-21.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 22-24 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Newly submitted claims 22-24 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: In the instant case, an amine or an amide compound differ in chemical structure, reactivity and use from an ene-amide derivative. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 22-24 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on 2/13/08.
Claims 12-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled.
Claims 22-24 are withdrawn, as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented

and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (WO 99/18065), in view of Tinsley (US 3,375,287).

The instant claims are drawn to a process for the production of ene-amide derivatives represented by the formula (I), from the reduction of an oxime derivative represented by the formula (II) with a heterogeneous catalyst, based on one metal selected from Pd, Ir, Pt, Rh or Ni, with an acyl derivative.

Johnson et al. teaches a process for the production of enamide derivatives of the formula 4, prepared by reduction of oximes of the formula 2, with a reducing metal M in the presence of an acylating agent (page 14, claim 1). The reaction temperature is at moderate temperatures <= 75°C, with moderate to good yields (40-85%, unoptimized) and in a high state of purity (page 5, lines 15-23). Johnson et al. exemplifies the synthesis of N-(3,4-dihydronaphthalen-1-yl)-acetamide using Fe as the catalyst (page 10, example 5, lines 20-27). Included is a washing step containing sodium hydroxide

(page 10, lines 24-25) and the acyl derivative (acetic anhydride and acetic acid) is used as the solvent (page 10, lines 20).

Johnson et al. is deficient in the sense that it does not use Applicant's particular hydrogenation catalyst metal, in Applicant's particular form, under hydrogen pressure and with the particular mineral salt.

Tinsley teaches the equivalency of catalytic reducing metals used for isomerization reactions, which include Ni, Pd, Pt, Rh, Ir, Fe and Ru (column 4, lines 1-2).

In regards to the particular form of the catalyst, the use of hydrogen pressure and the particular mineral salt, it is the position of the Examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would through routine and normal experimentation determine the optimization of these limitations to provide the best effective variable depending on the results desired. Thus it would be obvious in the optimization process to optimize the particular form of the catalyst, the use of hydrogen pressure and the particular mineral salt. The Applicant does not show any unusual and/or unexpected results for the limitations stated. Note that the prior art provides the same effect desired by Applicant, the production of enamide derivatives from oximes.

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to select a suitable hydrogenation catalyst, the particular form of the catalyst, the particular mineral salt, and to use hydrogen pressure, since Applicant's isomerization metals are well-known in the art. Absent any showing of unusual and/or unexpected results over applicant's particular catalyst metals, the art obtains the same

effect on the production and purification of the enamide derivatives . The expected result would be an efficient production of enamide derivatives for the chemical and pharmaceutical industries.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Y. Cho whose telephone number is (571) 272 6246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272 0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Cho
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1621

/SHAILENDRA - KUMAR/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621